

## REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 3, 4, 12, 13, 14 and 17-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, Second Paragraph. Claims 1, 2 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b). Claims 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a). Claims 1-7, 12, 13 and 17 are deleted by this amendment.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 3, 4, 12, 13, 14 and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, Second Paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which is regarded as the invention. In particular, the Examiner describes that in the noted claims, language is included which has one or more trademark/trade names which makes the claim scope uncertain because trademark or trade names cannot be used to properly identify any particular material or product. As such the Applicant has either deleted or amended the noted claims to move any direct reference to trademarks or trade names. As such the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, Second Paragraph is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 2 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,517,014 (Iijima). The applicant has deleted Claims 1-6 and as such this rejection is no longer applicable.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 3, 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being obvious in light of combinations of a number of references. Because these claims have been deleted, the rejection will not be addressed herein.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 8, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iijima in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2002/0184191 (Marpe et al.). In light of the amendments to the claims and the arguments made below the Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The Applicant's invention as recited in the claims is a method and system for controlling access to data stored in a shared directory. According to the Applicant's invention, entries are listed in a shared directory, wherein each entry includes an additional data field within which is included hierarchal information. When an entity logs onto the system and wishes to access the entries included therein, hierarchal information is associated with the ID of the entity logging on. This hierarchal information for the entity is then used to select entries which include the hierarchal information, and then compile the selected entries in a listing which is then displayed to the entity.

Iijima discloses a file management apparatus configured to inhibit an accessing operation for a plurality of areas within the files. Described is a scheme for limiting access to a particular portion of a file by a CPU wherein portions of a data file are encrypted to prohibit access unless the requesting IC card provides one or more unlocking bytes.

Marpe et al. discloses a system and method for querying a database. Items in the database are created and include a plurality of fields. The items are stored in a database with an identifier corresponding to the particular user. Upon receipt of a search query, the database is searched using the search query and the items associated with the identifier are located and displayed.

Claims 8 and 15 are non-obvious in light of the cited art because neither of these references teach or suggest the use of the user identification as a means to locate and compile records from a database. In Iijima, an unlocking bit is the means which is used to access a particular portion of a data file. This unlocking bit has nothing to do with the identity of a user.

In Marpe et al., the user put its own identifier in a data field such that when a search is performed, items which include that identifier are identified and retrieved. This is different than the Applicant's invention in that it does not employ hierarchal information associated with the

user's name, such as a company name or other such identifier in order to identify and retrieve information. The Applicant's invention is not directed towards having individual users have the ability to locate particular types of information depending on identifiers in data fields, but instead means whereby a certain class of users may be limited to access of only certain information in a database. The hierarchal information used in the Applicant's invention is associated with a certain class of user and although different users may access the system, the same information is compiled and presented to that particular class of user. As such based on the arguments made above the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Iijima and Marpe et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2003/0103493 (Mercuriali et al.). In light of the arguments made below and the amendments to the claims the applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As noted by the Examiner, Mercuriali et al. does disclose directory services which are employable for providing e-messaging. However in Mercuriali et al., there is no teaching or suggestion as to as with the other references cited above, the use of hierarchal information associated with a particular system user, wherein the hierarchal identifier employable to locate and built a directory specifically for that class of users which is then displayed.

The Examiner has further rejected Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Iijima and Marpe et al. and further view of US Patent Application Publication US 2002/0131573 (Berkley et al.). In light of the arguments made below the Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As the Examiner notes, Berkley discloses that identification information maybe configured in hierarchal form and include at least one company name and company location.

However, in Berkley et al. this information, once extracted from the user, is not used for the purpose of searching a database for records which also include this identifier, and then compiling, a view such that they are displayed to a system user.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Iijima and Marpe et al. and further in view of US Patent Application Publication US 2002/0174194 (Mooney et al.). The Applicant has cancelled Claim 12 and as such will only address this rejection as it relates to Claim 18.

As noted by the Examiner, Mooney et al. teaches that a directory may be configured on a Domino Server as part of a Lotus Notes application. Further, it also teaches that the Lotus Notes and Dominos Server may be employable for the purpose of setting up an e-mail account.

However, what Mooney et al., either alone or in combination with the other references, does not teach is the location and building of views associated with a particular organization. That is, if a number of organizations commonly store their address information in the shared directory, neither Mooney et al. or the other cited references teach a means for locating the entries associated with a particular organization and presenting them to a system user who has gained access.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 13 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Iijima, Marpe et al., and Mooney et al. and further in view of US Patent Application Publication US 2002/0029250 (Reiner). The Applicant has deleted Claim 13 and such will not address this rejection.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Iijima, Marpe et al. and in further view of US Patent

application Publication US 2002/0076015 (Norwitz et al.). In light of the arguments made below the Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

While Norwitz et al. does teach that a common database may include multiple entries for different individuals or organizations, it does not teach a means (either alone or in combination with the other cited references) for locating entries with a common hierarchal identifier and then compiling and presenting this information to a system user. As such, in light of the arguments made above the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) are respectfully traversed.

Based upon the foregoing, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and such disposition is respectfully requested. In the event that a telephone conversation would further prosecution and/or expedite allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSH FISCHMANN & BREYFOGLE LLP

By: 

Kenneth J. Johnson, Esq.

Registration No. 36,834

3151 South Vaughn Way, Suite 411

Aurora, Colorado 80014

Telephone: (303) 338-0997

Facsimile: (303) 338-1514

Date: December 5, 2003